R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 287 24 RC 002 344

NATIONAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION. FINAL REPORT.

BY- AURBACH, HERBERT A.
SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

REPORT NUMBER BR-7-0784 PUB DATE MAR 68
CONTRACT OEC-3-7-070784-3094
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.36 57P.

DESCRIPTORS- *AMERICAN INDIANS, CONFERENCES, CHILDREN, COORDINATION, *EDUCATION, EVALUATION, EDUCATIONAL POLICY, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, *GUIDELINES, HISTORICAL REVIEWS, INTELLIGENCE TESTS, LEADERSHIP, PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS, PLANNING, *RESEARCH PROJECTS, RESEARCH, *SURVEYS, TESTING, HEW,

A CONFERENCE WAS HELD FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING GUIDELINES FOR A STATUS SURVEY AND RESEARCH PROJECT IN AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION. THREE BACKGROUND PAPERS WERE PRESENTED WHICH PROVIDED AN HISTORICAL REVIEW OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH IN INDIAN EDUCATION, ANALYZED CURRENT RESEARCH, AND CONSIDERED CURRENT ACTION PROGRAMS. PANELISTS DISCUSSED THE KINDS OF RESEARCH NEEDED AND CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS MADE THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS--(1) A NATIONAL RESEARCH PROJECT ON INDIAN EDUCATION IS NEEDED IN WHICH INDIAN LEADERSHIP WOULD BE A PREREQUISITE, (2) SUCH A RESEARCH PROJECT SHOULD BE MULTI-DISCIPLINARY IN ITS APPROACH, (3) INDISCRIMINATE INTELLIGENCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING OF INDIAN CHILDREN SHOULD BE AVOIDED, (4) EVALUATION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURES SHOULD PROVIDE FOR IN-DEPTH STUDY AND AN ADEQUATE CROSS-SECTION OF INDIAN CHILDREN, (5) THE OVERALL PLANNING, DIRECTION, AND COORDINATION SHOULD BE LOCATED IN A SINGLE RESEARCH ORGANIZATION, (6) INDIAN RESEARCHERS SHOULD BE TRAINED AND USED IN THE OPERATIONS OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT, AND (7) RESEARCH RESULTS SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE INDIAN LEADERSHIP IN ORDER TO DEVELOP EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND ESTABLISH EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS. (JS)

BR-7-0784
P.A. 24

ED018287

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 70784-24
Contract No. 3-7-070784-3094

NATIONAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION

March 1968

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

RC002344

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 70784
Contract No. 3-7-070784-3094

NATIONAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION

Herbert A. Aurbach

The Society for the Study of Social Problems
Kalamazoo, Michigan

March 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	5
The Problem of Indian Education	5
SSSP and Its Interests in the Problem	5
Interest of OE in the Problem	6
The Conference and Its Purposes	8
Planning the Conference	9
Participants	9
Conference Format and Proceedings	11
SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS	
Background Presentation I: An Historical Perspective - A Selective Review and Critical Evaluation of Earlier Research Efforts on American Indian Education - PHILLEO NASH	13
Panel Discussion I: Reactions to and Commentaries on Background Presentation I	15
Francis McKinley	15
Edward H. Spicer	15
Victor Charlo	16
Background Presentation II: Current Research on American Indian Education - A Critical Review of Selected Ongoing Studies - WILLIAM H. KELLY	16
Background Presentation III: A Selective Review of Current Action Programs in Indian Education and Their Implications for Research - JAMES J. WILSON	18
Panel Discussion II: Reactions to and Commentaries on Background Presentations II and III	19
Murray Wax	19
Robert Thomas	20
Bernard Spilka	20
Robert A. Roessel, Jr.	20
James E. Officer	20
Vine Deloria	21

Page

Panel Discussion III: What Kinds of Research on Indian Education Are Needed? 21
Glen Nimnicht 21
Thomas A. Segundo 22
Samuel Stanley. 23
Sol Tax 23
Miles V. Zintz. 23
Ronald Corwin 24

Panel Discussion IV: How Can Conceptualizations Drawn from Social, Behavioral and Educational Theory and Research Be Applied to the Study of Indian Education? 24
Brewton Berry 24
Samuel M. Brownell. 24
Irwin Deutscher 24
David W. Stevens. 24
Melvin D. Thom. 25

Plenary Session: Suggested Approaches to A National Study of American Indian Education. 26
Summary of General Discussion 26
Resolution. 27

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONFERENCE 28

POST-CONFERENCE ACTIVITIES. 32

REFERENCES. 34

APPENDIX A: Conference Program 35

APPENDIX B: Conference Participants. 42

APPENDIX C: Project Consultants. 45

APPENDIX D: Contributors to Conference Proceedings 46

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to acknowledge the special assistance we have had in the development of this project and of the Conference which was its central focus.

The Colleges of Education and Liberal Arts of The Pennsylvania State University not only co-sponsored and hosted the Conference, but provided more material resources including funds for important Conference services to which federal funds could not be applied, the housing of the Conference staff, and general encouragement and support for the Project Director. In particular, Kenneth D. Roose, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts; A. W. VanderMeer, Dean of the College of Education; Donald P. Kent, Head of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and Earl E. Edgar, former Chairman of Cultural Foundations of Education, were most helpful.

The Conference took place in the excellent facilities of the Center for Continuing Education at the University. The staff of that Center and especially John W. Beatty, who acted as Conference Coordinator, were extremely helpful in handling the mass of details necessary in carrying out such a Conference.

Special thanks are due Mrs. Georgeann Robinson, Vice-President of the National Congress of American Indians, Ozzie G. Simmons, University of Colorado and Paul B. Foreman and William F. Nydegger, The Pennsylvania State University, who chaired major sessions of the Conference, and the several participants who chaired the various small group discussions.

The officers and staff of the Society for the Study of Social Problems gave great assistance in getting this project off the ground and in keeping it going. Melvin Tumin, during his term as President of the Society, conceived the idea of this project and of the Society's role in sponsoring the Conference. Irene Horning, the Administrative Manager of the Society, handled the many details involved in the administration of the project, for the Society. There has been continuing support and encouragement from the Executive Committee of the Society.

SUMMARY

The project reported here centered around a research conference on American Indian education held at The Pennsylvania State University May 24-27, 1967, sponsored by the Society for the Study of Social Problems and the University. Among the objectives of the Conference were:

1. To provide a forum for persons representing diverse groups, and with different types of experience in Indian education research, to express their viewpoints on the needs for long-range research and development in Indian education.

2. To provide guidelines, specifically, for a national status survey of Indian education which was being planned by the U. S. Office of Education.

Over 50 distinguished participants attended, including leaders of Indian organizations and tribal groups, social and behavioral scientists, educators, and officials of governmental agencies concerned with the education of Indians.

Early sessions of the Conference centered around three prepared background papers which provided an historical review of previous research in Indian education, analyzed current research then being conducted, and considered the implications of current action programs for research. Panelists discussed the kinds of research needed in the field and the conceptualizations that can be drawn from theory and research in related areas that could be applied to the study of Indian education. The remainder of the Conference consisted of discussions by the participants in small and large groups.

There was general consensus about the following recommendations:

A. A national study of Indian education is greatly needed and should be begun as expeditiously as possible. Such a study should:

   1) Provide Indian leadership with systematic and objective information about the attitudes, aspirations, and expectations of a cross-section of their peoples regarding education.

   2) Provide Indian leadership and the officials of governmental and non-governmental educational agencies which serve Indian children

with basic information to assist in planning more effectively for the educational needs of the Indian populace.

3) Provide governmental agencies with information for arriving at a more adequate basis for the allocation of demonstration and research funds for Indian education.

4) Provide base line data so that experimental and demonstration programs can be more adequately and systematically compared over a period of time with each other and with current ongoing programs.

5) Systematically draw together, summarize and evaluate the results of past and current research on Indian education so as to more adequately articulate the results of those studies with current and future instructional programs and research studies.

6) Draw together findings from research on the education of other sub-cultural groups in American society (e.g., the American Negro) and of sub-cultural groups in other societies (e.g., the Yemenites in Isarel) which have particular relevance to programs for American Indian education.

B. Such a study should draw upon the theoretical conceptualizations and methodological approaches of several of the various social and behavioral science disciplines, each applied in a coordinated but independent manner to the examination of Indian education. Such a multi-disciplinary approach was regarded as preferable to a fully-integrated inter-disciplinary approach which might dilute the unique contributions of the various participating disciplines.

C. Intelligence and psychological testing (including achievement tests) should be utilized in this study only after a thorough examination of the relevance of these tests when applied to populations of Indian children and only after a thorough investigation of the availability of the same or comparable data on the subject population. It was felt that there had been far too much repetitive, and indiscriminate use of, testing on Indian children in past research studies.

D. Such a study should include some aspects which will allow for the observation or periodic restudy of Indian educational settings over an extended period of time. This phase would allow for in-depth study of changes that occur in the children and in the school, and of the structural processes which affect these changes.

E. Such a study must utilize sampling procedures that will assure an adequate cross-section of Indian children in the various kinds of school settings in which they are presently being educated. This should include Bureau of Indian Affairs schools, public schools and mission schools, and should include schools located in various social settings (e.g., reservations, rural non-reservation locales, and urban areas), and institutions of higher education and vocational as well as academic schools. This cross-section should include some representation of the various broad types of cultural patterns found among the over 300 Indian tribal groups located in various geographic regions of the nation. For this purpose it would seem that the major unit of study should be the school as a socio-cultural institution.

F. Such a study should probably involve in its field operations a number of different research institutions located centrally to areas where sizable numbers of Indians are located. The overall planning, direction, and coordination, however, should be located in a single research organization.

G. The major recommendation of the Conference, one that was supported unanimously in a resolution passed by the participants attending its concluding session, was that Indian leadership must be involved in all the major decisions leading to the development and implementation of such a study. Indian leadership should have a major voice in selecting the director(s) of the study and auspices under which it is conducted. It was further recommended that the mechanism for involving Indian leadership in this decision-making process should be the National Indian Education Advisory Committee. There was also general agreement that Indians should have major involvement in the study by:

1) engaging, to the fullest extent possible, Indians who are professionally trained researchers in the design and direction of the study.

2) training and utilizing Indians, to the fullest extent possible, in data collection and analysis.

3) presenting the research results in such a manner as to be of maximum use to Indian leadership in the development of educational policies for Indians and in recommending more effective educational programs to serve Indian peoples.

In the several months following the Conference, the staff participated with Indian leaders and governmental officials in planning for a national study of American Indian education and in the development of a proposal for a three-year study to be funded by the U. S. Office of Education.

INTRODUCTION

The Problem of Indian Education

It has become clear that Indians will not vanish in the near future. The population of American Indians is steadily increasing, at a rate of growth above the general population. This population (estimated between one half and three quarters of a million persons) continues to live a life dissimilar to the typical American and, in certain salient ways, dissimilar to other minority groups as well. The price they have thus far paid -- both for attempting to preserve their own culture and for attempting to assimilate into the broader culture -- has been a high incidence of poverty and rates of unemployment as high as fifty percent on Indian reservations, according to a Bureau of Indian Affairs report (1). In addition, many Indians undoubtedly experience personal anxieties revolving around an "identity crisis" generating from conflicting family and societal expectations.

Both the economic condition and identity crisis undoubtedly are related to the type and quality of their education. The 150,000 Indian children enrolled in schools (of all types) represent only a portion of the total Indian school age population. The 1966 Manpower Report of the President (2) reports that in the late 1950's more than fifty percent of Indian students in all types of schools dropped out before graduation; this figure is substantiated by Bureau of Indian Affairs reports (3).

By comparison with this dropout rate, the USOE's Survey of Equal Educational Opportunity (4) shows that Indians in public schools do want to continue in school and nearly two in five of them want to excel. Yet nearly half of the respondents indicated that they sometimes feel they can't learn.

Among the reasons for dropout rates of this magnitude are cultural difference in educational expectations between Indians and other American groups and lack of parent support (5,6). The problem of improving education is compounded by the wide range of differences among and within Indian groups and by inadequate knowledge about the expectations of the Indian people.

The situation which these facts reflect cannot be adequately understood, nor even described, without further research and fresh perspectives and approaches to the problem.

SSSP and Its Interests in the Problem

The Society for the Study of Social Problems was formed some fifteen years ago by a number of members of the American Sociological Society who felt that, in addition to the general and theoretical areas

to which the Society traditionally had addressed itself, there needed to be a forum whereby members of the sociological profession could more completely discuss the application of social science knowledge to critical issues and concrete problems of contemporary society. Their interest was in creating an organization concerned with the areas of applied sociology and with the application of theoretical framework and scientific method of social science to such problems as poverty, international tensions, intergroup relations, and crime and delinquency.

About three years ago, the official journal of the Society, Social Problems, published, as a special supplement, what proved to be one of its most successful monographs, Formal Education in an American Indian Community, by Murray Wax and his associates (7).

Melvin Tumin, president of the Society during 1965-66, began exploring ways to follow up on the interest generated by the Wax monograph. With the approval of the Executive Committee, he suggested that the Society, in collaboration with other institutions, sponsor a national conference on research in Indian education. He asked Herbert A. Aurbach of The Pennsylvania State University, and secretary-treasurer of the Society, to draw up and submit a proposal to the U. S. Office of Education to fund such a conference. Dr. Aurbach also agreed to serve as project director. The Pennsylvania State University graciously offered to co-sponsor the conference with the Society and to serve as host institution.

For the Society, the conference, which was the central focus of this project, represented a major opportunity to bring to bear the specialized knowledge of sociology and other social and behavioral sciences upon a critical problem facing American society. It also provided the chance for social and behavioral scientists to meet leaders of Indian communities and organizations, in the field of education, and in those governmental agencies concerned with the welfare and education of the American Indian. It was felt that the wide experience of the practitioners in this area would provide valuable insights that would help the academicians frame their research in more realistic and meaningful terms and pose more relevant research questions. They could thereby avoid many of the pitfalls of applying methodological techniques that do not adequately account for the variety of contingencies researchers must face in the field. And, hopefully, the conference might suggest ways in which research findings might be more meaningfully stated, so that these findings in turn could help practitioners and Indian leaders develop more effective educational programs to meet the needs of all Indian children.

Interest of OE in the Problem

At the time that the proposal was submitted, the Bureau of Research, U. S. Office of Education, had funded eight completed research projects on Indian education. Four of these studies concerned factors

contributing to the educational failure and success of Indian children, two concern bilingual problems, and two concern differences between the home and school environments of Indian children. Also, American Indians were one of six racial groups singled out for study in the Office of Education's Survey of Equality of Educational Opportunity; two research centers funded by the Bureau are continuing to analyze these data.

The Bureau of Research was also supporting three ongoing projects. One of the funded projects was a comparative study of the educational problems encountered by Indian children in urban and rural public schools in Eastern Oklahoma. A second was a study of the social factors which influence the rate of acculturation in two Washo Indian communities in Nevada. In a third study, ethnographic techniques were being used to assess the role which education plays in four Chippewa villages in Minnesota and the social factors which affect the performance of Indian children in school.

The education of American Indians was also part of the responsibility of USOE's regional educational laboratories. Three projects were in progress, funded through the regional cooperative educational laboratory program. One with the Upper Midwest Cooperative Educational Laboratory, concerned the development and distribution of a handbook for teachers of Chippewa children to assist them in providing guidance to Indian children and in collecting data to identify further problems. The other two were with the Southwest Cooperative Education Laboratory. One was a five-year nationwide study of the achievement of 3,500 high school students in four types of schools (under contract with Bureau of Indian Affairs); the other study was for the purpose of establishing baseline data of the characteristics of students on three reservations in preparation for a longitudinal study of Indian education in Arizona.

In the proposal for this project, it was suggested that if the Bureau was to expand these efforts, a more systematic long-range program of research and development was needed to help provide fresh perspectives and supply needed information about the actual and potential role of education in diverse Indian settings. A national research conference on American Indian education would provide a forum for the expression of viewpoints that could help in formulating guidelines for a research program. The effectiveness of the program would be improved immeasurably if government officials, Indian leaders, and specialists in minority group relations, Indian culture and Indian education were provided the opportunity to exchange views during the planning stages of an expanded research program. It was felt that the Conference would help to expose potential methodological problems, prevent some blind alleys, raise salient questions that need to be answered, and identify primary target populations and sources of information.

It was further believed that the conference also would help to overcome another obstacle to an expanded research program in Indian education -- the limited supply of competent researchers in this field. The conference would: 1) encourage experienced researchers in the field to exert their leadership; 2) help identify both younger and more mature researchers potentially interested in this field; 3) put less experienced researchers in this field in contact with more experienced researchers, Indian leaders, government officials and educators; and 4) publicize for the research community USOE's interest in Indian education.

The Conference and Its Purposes

This mutual interest of the Society for the Study of Social Problems and the U. S. Office of Education resulted in the funding by U.S.O.E. of a National Research Conference on American Indian Education. Sponsored by the Society and The Pennsylvania State University, the invitational conference was held on the campus of the university.

As stated in the project proposal, the objectives of the Conference were:

(1) To provide a forum for persons representing diverse groups, and with different types of experience in Indian education research, to express their viewpoints on the needs for long-range research and development in Indian education.

(2) To provide guidelines, specifically, for a national status survey of Indian education which is being planned by the U. S. Office of Education.

(3) To identify and to encourage competent researchers who might wish to become involved in interdisciplinary research in the field of Indian education.

It was anticipated that the Conference would provide a forum for government officials, Indian leaders, and for social scientists and educators with special interest and knowledge about Indian education, Indian culture and minority group relations to exchange views about research needs and potential directions for research studies on Indian education. In addition, it would provide an opportunity to review critically past and present research in this area and to consider the impact such studies have had on existing programs for educating Indian children. It was expected that the Conference would provide guidelines for future research by helping to expose potential methodological problems, preventing some blind alleys, raising salient questions that

needed to be answered, and identifying primary target populations and sources of information. It also was hoped that the Conference would:

(1) encourage experienced researchers in the field of Indian education to exert their leadership;

(2) help identify both younger and more mature researchers potentially interested in this field;

(3) put less experienced researchers in this field in contact with experienced researchers, Indian leaders, government officials, and educators;

(4) publicize to the research community USOE's expanding interest in Indian education.

Planning the Conference

The format of the Conference was planned during March and April, 1967. The major responsibility lay with the Project Director, but he was ably advised by a group of distinguished consultants, including: Brewton Berry, Professor Emeritus of Sociology, Ohio State University; Madison Coombs, Deputy Assistant Commissioner for Education, Bureau of Indian Affairs; Ronald Corwin, Professor of Sociology, Ohio State University (then with USOE); Vine Deloria, Executive Director, National Congress of American Indians; Ozzie Simmons, Professor of Sociology, University of Colorago; Edward Spicer, Professor of Anthropology, University of Arizona; and Sol Tax, Professor of Anthropology, University of Chicago. In addition, Wendell Chino, Chairman, National Indian Education Advisory Committee; William Kelly, Director, Bureau of Ethnic Research, University of Arizona; Carl Marburger; then Assistant Commissioner for Education, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Philleo Nash, former Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs; Melvin Thom, Executive Director, National Indian Youth Council; and James Wilson, Director, Indian Division, Office of Economic Opportunity/Community Action Programs, were consulted.

The Conference was planned to allow for a maximum of free discussion. Only three prepared papers were requested. The remainder of the Conference was to center around panel discussions and small group discussions. The format was designed to be flexible and allowed for adjustment during the Conference to meet the needs of the participants. (See Conference Program, Appendix A.)

Participants

Participation in the Conference was by invitation, and every effort was made to have broad representation. Conference participants were

selected to represent the following categories:

(1) Senior social scientists and educational researchers with research experience on American Indian education, American Indian culture, or the education or problems of other socio-economically disadvantaged groups.

(2) Younger social scientists and educational researchers judged by consultants and senior participants to show potential interest and promise in this field of research.

(3) Educators experienced in Indian education.

(4) Leaders of major national and tribal organizations representing American Indians.

(5) Representatives of state and federal agencies concerned with the education of the American Indian.

(6) Some degree of geographic representation.

An examination of the list of over fifty distinquished participants (Appendix B) will indicate the considerable extent to which this broad representation was achieved. Among the academic disciplines there was representation from anthropology, economics, education, psychology and sociology. Education specialists were also represented by several federal and state agencies (including the B.I.A., O.E., and O.E.O.) and regional educational laboratories. There were representatives of several national Indian organizations and leaders of several Indian tribal groups, as well as of service organizations concerned with the problems of the American Indian. There were, of course, a number of people who represented several of these categories (e.g., an American Indian leader who is an executive of a federal agency, holds a doctorate in education, and has several years of experience as a practicing educator among Indians.)

There was representation from seventeen states and the District of Columbia. Not unexpectedly, the heaviest representation was from the Western region and especially the Mountain states of Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah. There also was considerable participation from the Southern region (primarily the Washington, D. C. metropolitan area and Oklahoma), as well as from the North Central region (Illinois, Kansas, and Nebraska) and even from the Northeast (primarily Pennsylvania).

Conference Format and Proceedings

The early sessions of the Conference were centered around the three prepared background papers; the first, by Dr. Philleo Nash, provided a historical review of previous research on American Indians; the second, by Dr. William Kelly, provided a review of current research being conducted; and the third, by Dr. James Wilson, gave an overview of current action programs in this area and their implications for research. These were the only papers prepared in advance of the Conference. Nash's paper and the papers of Kelly and Wilson were followed by informal remarks by panels of discussants and by general discussion from the floor.

In subsequent sessions, third and fourth panels were each devoted to a specific question that had been posed in advance. The third discussed the kinds of research on Indian education that were needed. The fourth focused on the kinds of conceptualizations that can be drawn from related fields and applied to the study of Indian education. Each of the panel discussions elicited general discussion from the total group, which was then continued in small discussion groups of from seven to nine participants, where specific points of interest could be dealt with in greater depth. The deliberations of the small groups were then summarized and reported to the total conference by the small-group chairmen. During the small-group sessions, the chairman had the assistance of a graduate student who served as a recorder.

The participants informally decided to eliminate the last small-group session that had planned to deal with specific methodological techniques, feeling that this kind of detail could most fruitfully be handled by the actual research teams involved in any subsequent studies.

The final plenary session began with a summary of the general areas of agreement among the Conference participants as a whole, and proceeded to a round-table presentation and discussion of several suggestions for specific research approaches and recommendations for new directions for future research. By now the total attendance had diminished to about thirty-five (because of the exigencies of academic life and air travel connections), and interaction seemed greatly heightened. This discussion and its final recommendations have since been considered by the participants to have been particularly effective and valuable.

Summaries of the major papers and the remarks of the panel discussants are presented in the following section. A more complete report of the proceedings of the Conference, including summaries of all small-group and general discussions, may be found in the Interim Report of this project (8). Some of the panelists had written out their remarks, which they submitted for this publication, as did the major speakers. (In some cases, references were later added to the spoken remarks.) Most panelists spoke from notes, however, and for them, the

conference staff prepared transcripts taken from tape recordings. These were edited and revised by the discussants in only minor ways, primarily to clarify statements or to eliminate trivia and repetition. In several instances the tape reproduction was so poor that the panelists were asked to reconstruct what they had said and they graciously agreed to do so. Only two of the panelists failed to take the opportunity to edit and revise their own remarks and in these two instances minor editing was done by the Conference staff.

The general discussions from the floor and in small groups were all tape recorded, but were not included verbatim in the Proceedings for several reasons. After four days of meetings, much repetition is unavoidable since a later speaker may not have been present when a similar comment was made earlier. Also, the actual transcripts often lacked continuity in that a particular comment might not necessarily have been inspired by the previous one, but by something said some time before. In addition, many points made during the open discussion were later elaborated in the small-group discussions. Therefore, we summarized the major points made in these discussions, editing out repetition wherever possible. Since we were not always able to identify the persons associated with particular ideas, and since the same idea often was expressed independently in different small-group sessions, we did not use the names of participants in our summaries of either the general or small-group discussions. It should be noted that there was wide and enthusiastic participation in these discussions and many persons made important contributions in each session.

Unfortunately, the tape recording of the short general discussion which followed the final panel session was of such poor quality that it could not be reconstructed. However, most of the major points made were reiterated in the plenary session which followed.

For the final plenary session we attempted to summarize the major points that were made. In this one instance we worked almost entirely from written notes, since our tape recording equipment was inoperative during this session.

SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS*

Background Presentation I: An Historical Perspective - A Selective Review and Critical Evaluation of Earlier Research Efforts on American Indian Education

Philleo Nash

Tracing the background of Indian education research, Dr. Nash first pointed out that before the "modern era" began with the publication of the Meriam Report in 1928, the philosophy of the Indian Service had generally been one of harsh "institutional deculturation." The Meriam Report criticized off-reservation boarding schools and recommended community-oriented day schools, emphasizing the whole child and his relationship to family and community. This progressive policy, Dr. Nash felt, has since been the basic educational approach of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Ten years later an arrangement was made with the University of Chicago to measure the effect of the changes. Two sets of studies emerged, one in the field of personality and culture, the other dealing with the learning ability of Indian children, particularly as related to other variables in their development. In this connection, Dr. Nash said, studies by Havighurst and others showed that while a lag in age-grade equivalent existed, it could not be blamed on any biological basis, that performance differed in different federal schools, and that it was related to degree of acculturation.

In 1950, Kansas University was chosen to carry out research on Indian education with emphasis on acculturative factors as related to achievement levels and the testing of the steady improvement hypothesis. These studies showed a definite relationship between achievement levels and a number of acculturation variables. They also tied degree of achievement to kind of school attended, with public Indian schools ranked best and federal day schools lowest.

After the Anderson studies at Kansas, it was decided that testing on a large scale was needed. Two principal findings emerged: 1) the familiar fact that Indian children achieve better in public than federal

*All references in this summary section have been omitted. They may be found in the interim report of this project, Proceedings of the National Research Conference on American Indian Education, op. cit.

schools, and 2) the clear indication that Indian children fall progressively behind their white counterparts as they move into higher grades. The consensus of opinion was that this lag was caused by a deficiency in English and that special emphasis should be placed on language arts at all levels in BIA schools.

In 1964 the BIA was asked by a Senate committee to evaluate the Bordertown Dormitory Program in which Navajo children live in BIA-operated dorms near reservations and attend public schools under BIA contract. No special treatment is received by the Navajo children attending these schools, and since they are from deprived homes, it is obvious that they will perform poorly. The survey, in fact, showed that Navajo high school students perform in the lowest percentile in all types of schools attended. In other words, Dr. Nash said, all types of education now available to Navajo high school students are failing, a fact obscured by the unfortunate battle between public and federal schools because of the funds involved. How did this come about?

The BIA philosophy has always been that the education of Indian children is the responsibility of the states. Because some of these children have special problems, however, the BIA has to operate a large boarding school system, but these schools can be turned over to local districts. After World War II, federal funds became available for public schools where children were living on federal military reservations. Indian children were defined as "federal children" and their public schools costs as a "federal impact." Two results followed: day schools began leaving the federal system and joined public school districts, and the Indian child acquired a price on his head--which meant that his best interests were no longer the main issue.

Congress became interested in this problem, but although it recommended, in 1961, a study of Indian education, it never appropriated the $300,000 requested for it by the BIA. Fortunately, money has now become available through Health, Education, and Welfare so that this study can go forward. Much research has been performed in various areas of Indian education by different universities, but many questions remain to be investigated. The role of adult education, vocational-technical education, mental health problems, and the effects of Headstart are other fruitful areas for research.

Dr. Nash urged that, rather than comparing school systems, the participants of the Conference should ascertain what the educational needs of Indians really are today. It is likely, he felt, that community development must go with classroom improvement. He said that he had left behind him in the BIA a program designed to upgrade Indian education, but the money needed was not forthcoming. Nevertheless, if research would result in the funding of improved Indian education, this research should proceed as soon as possible.

Panel Discussion I: Reactions to and Commentaries on Background Presentation I

Francis McKinley

Mr. McKinley felt that culture has been the main concern in Indian education, rather than the realities faced by the teacher in the classroom. If the teachers cannot apply research to the classroom realities, this is the fault of the researchers who often leave the reservation, after getting data for their own use, without trying to interpret and suggest practical applications of these findings. Research workers should also be encouraged to transmit their findings to schools and agencies involved in Indian education.

Mr. McKinley spoke of the movement of Indians to urban areas, with the resultant transfer of more Indian children to integrated schools and the need for urban educators to compare Indians with other groups. When BIA schools were closed in the early 1950's and Indian students were transferred to public schools, educators had little objective information about these children. He said that on his own reservation educators were advised to treat them like the other children, the assumption being that they could be assimilated into the learning process without extra help.

Culture and personality studies that give up to date information are certainly needed, Mr. McKinley said, for in his work with Indian youth, he has found that many of their problems stem from a lack of image and identity.

Edward H. Spicer

Disagreement was voiced by Dr. Spicer with Dr. Nash's feeling that comparison of school systems was a waste; he felt that these comparisons were necessary to determine how different schools in broad contrasting systems meet Indian needs. As for the Meriam Report, he thought that Dr. Nash felt it had put the BIA on the right track in Indian education. While some wise reforms followed, Dr. Spicer conceded, it also laid the foundations for the impasse indicated in the recurrent findings regarding Indian educational "retardation." The Meriam Report, he said, viewed educational processes as functioning primarily to help Indian societies adjust to the dominant one, with no idea of mutual adaptation. The Chicago studies took the view that Indian culture was, and might continue to be, an important part of these children's lives and that the schools should help in mutual adaptation.

These studies received very limited application because the Meriam approach dominated Congressional and BIA thinking. But another factor probably was the idea that Indian cultures were similar and unchanging,

whereas this is not so. Schools function to promote both satisfactory adjustment and maladjustment, and in order to know what schools are accomplishing and how to evaluate them, Dr. Spicer said, we must know more about what is going on within Indian society.

Summing up his views, Dr. Spicer said that since Indian populations have different cultures, the needs required by each will be different and this will influence their school systems. By developing a common framework for the comparative analysis of schools, this group could help the schools become better adapted to accomplish the objectives set up.

Victor Charlo

Several points seemed of major importance to him, Mr. Charlo said. The first was that Indian education, or any education, should be a family affair. In order to have effective education, the whole family has to be involved. The parents have to feel that the school is their school and that their children go to school because the parents have an interest. The parents must know what is happening in the school. An effective school is one with parent involvement.

The second point he wanted to stress was that of financial poverty, for how could a youngster try to learn in school if he had neither sufficient food nor adequate clothing? When you are concerned with survival, you are not too interested in education; thus, poverty is one of the biggest blocks to education today.

Background Presentation II: Current Research on American Indian Education - A Critical Review of Selected Ongoing Studies

William H. Kelly

There have been two well-defined current trends in Indian education research projects; one towards research and development, demonstration and classroom experiments; the other toward psychological studies of the acculturation process in education.

Both types of projects revolve around bilingualism and biculturalism and the educational institution as a part of the community system. Of further interest is the fact that many other specialists have joined in this research. Thus, theory and method from broad areas could be applied to the situation, but unfortunately it has sometimes led to "disciplinary abstraction." Research workers are, however, in agreement on the following points:

1. Most Indian students are deficient in English.

2. Most Indian communities possess a local Indian culture and elements of a culture of deprivation.

3. This combination places the Indian child at a disadvantage in school where he must function in a context designed for non-Indians.

Dr. Kelly said that the many research problems on Indian education could be integrated through supportive research, research and development, and administration. Although no provision has been made in the BIA budget for research and development, it is recognized that this is a vital part of education efforts, and programs have been carried on both by Bureau personnel and outsiders. He cited several outstanding programs in teaching English as a second language (TESL) and new teaching and curriculum programs, Pine Ridge, South Dakota, Rough Rock, Arizona, and the University of Alaska, plus seven new experimental and demonstration schools planned by the Office of Education.

Dr. Kelly stressed that no real link between the researcher and the teacher was possible unless the "statistical" and the "anthropological" child were recognized in the behavior of humans with diverse and common qualities. An objective appraisal of research results and careful controls are needed in projects, he said.

In supportive research, bilingualism, biculturalism and the acculturation process are of central interest on most current research projects. Three types of studies are attracting the most attention: 1) psychologically-oriented; 2) culturally-oriented; 3) culture and personality oriented. The psychologically-oriented studies work on the basis of individual experience and results in academic performance and adjustment, with sub groups being defined through statistical rather than anthropological methods. This method can better deal with diversity and heterogeneity and can lend itself to cross-cultural testing. The work of Graves, Powers and Michener with Sioux, Navajo and Pueblo students were cited as examples, as well as the Spilka project on the Sioux.

The culturally-oriented method is typified by the work of Murray Wax and his associates, in which they start with a study of Indian history and culture and relate it to patterns that develop in student and parental response to the behavior of educators. On the Sioux reservation they found the key concept to be isolation, with a lack of communication between students, parents, and educators.

A number of studies related to the culture and personality theory have stemmed from the interest of George and Louise Spindler in Indian acculturation. Dr. Kelly mentioned specifically the work of Peter Sindell, who studied the La Tuque Indian Residential School in Quebec.

In summing up, Dr. Kelly said research showed that uniformities in Indian education problems outweighed special problems created by local differences. The situation can be helped through teacher training, change in educators' attitudes, and curriculum changes which recognize the difference between Anglo and Indian thinking and language differences. Fundamental problems of values and biculturalism, however, will require not only research but more participation by Indian leaders and parents in the education process. Dr. Kelly said that the many projects conducted by men from different disciplines complement each other, and he suggested that a multidisciplinary study of one community or area might produce significant results.

Background Presentation III: A Selective Review of Current Action Programs in Indian Education and Their Implications for Research

James J. Wilson

Dr. Wilson began by saying that Indian education does not have a formula that would produce a uniformly well-educated product. He then turned to a discussion of some of the many current action programs and their implications for research. Two that he considered of special interest were the Rough Rock Demonstration School directed by Robert Roessel and one on the Pine Ridge Sioux Reservation directed by Father John Bryde. The Rough Rock School is the center of the community, with parents free to come at any time, and enthusiasm high, Dr. Wilson said. Adult education and culture identification are parts of the total process. The Pine Ridge program is, as Father Bryde puts it, "a study of how to be like the old time Indians (through Indian history and culture) and yet make our living in the modern world."

The National Indian Education Advisory Committee was established in December 1966 by Commissioner Bennett of the BIA. It has 16 members (15 representing tribes with the majority of Indian children in federal schools), and it has undertaken a self-education program, the information it gathers to be passed on to education committees on the reservations.

Four regional educational labs are undertaking a long-range program to improve American Indian education. The projects include the following: 1) six demonstration Headstart classrooms for four and five year olds; 2) an experimental program to develop language skills through a bilingual approach; 3) a long-range effort to improve the child's self-image through his culture. These labs are in the Rocky Mountain area, the Northwest, Far West and Southwest.

Arizona State University has an Indian Education Center offering an M. A. in this field with a wide variety of courses and studies.

Again this summer several hundred Indian high school students will spend time on a college campus gaining valuable social as well as academic insights. Thousands of Indian children are attending year-round Headstart programs sponsored by tribal councils to help with language development. Even adults are learning--through community action programs, they are getting G.E.D. diplomas.

Dr. Wilson felt, however, that many of the research projects in Indian education have not been applied to classroom situations. He also felt that much time is spent trying to teach subjects rather than teaching the student how to learn. In order to educate a child, he said, the teacher must know not only the system he is teaching but also the system from which the learner gets his point of reference. With 30 children in a class, for instance,each with different reference points, ability, and parental support, much research would need to be done. To increase our chances for success, class size in the early grades should be cut; moreover, teachers and parents should get into each other's environment. Dr. Wilson said statistics cannot substitute for experimentation in education, exploration, and teaching the learning processes. The Indian student can be reached through culture identification; he need not give up one culture for another, but can have the best of both.

Panel Discussion II: Reactions to and Commentaries on Background Presentations II and III

Murray Wax

Dr. Wax pointed out that in certain countries there are groups which have retained their own language and culture--in Yugoslavia, for instance, and the French in Canada and the Indians in Latin America. Another example was the Amish, who have resisted having their children go to local high schools, knowing they may lose their ethnic identity.

These issues are ones of values and power. In the case of the American Indian, alienation has resulted from their sense of not having enough power over their own lives.

Another factor was that while our schools focus on competition among individuals, the Indian peer society is a cooperative unit. Dr. Wax wondered if, instead of trying to break down this attitude, we could work with it as an education mechanism.

Robert Thomas

Mr. Thomas said that though the Cherokees once had a high literacy rate, it is low now. Today they are unenthused about schools. As an experiment, an action research program was tried recently in teaching the Cherokee language; the only school where it really succeeded was one where parents were actively involved and the Cherokee heritage emphasized.

One of the reasons educational systems haven't been accepted by the Indians, he said, is because this inevitably takes members out of the tribal group--a loss of self. The only way to counteract this problem would be for Indians to control their schools, all the way through college.

Bernard Spilka

As a psychologist, Dr. Spilka said, he has biases toward quantitative research, and he is concerned with getting valid and reliable data, although he recognized the feelings of those who want practical applications. He pointed out that the culture of poverty was more significant than "Indian culture" in educational problems, and said he hopes that this conference can set some specifications and direction for research.

Robert A. Roessel, Jr.

One of the most important points for researchers to realize, Dr. Roessel said, is that they must work to bring about developments wanted by the Indian people themselves. This feeling of involvement he illustrated by a description of the work at the Rough Rock Demonstration school.

The school board is made up of uneducated Indians, and they make the decisions. In the research going on, Dr. Roessel felt it was imperative not to lose sight of the Indian people; if they are involved, research efforts are much improved.

James E. Officer

Dr. Officer said that in his opinion the Conference was dealing with different kinds of research: 1) a descriptive statement of the existing situation in Indian education (such as suggested by a status report) -- to be useful it must be structured in practical and applied terms; 2) research related to evaluation, which must look at existing approaches and try to evaluate how well they are achieving their objectives, and 3) pure research.

Dr. Officer discussed the second and third approaches. Examples of programs for which evaluation studies are needed include: the Rough Rock program mentioned by previous speakers; an experimental approach to reaching delinquent or potentially delinquent children through art, music and literature at the Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe; and a program in teaching English as a second language begun on the Navajo Reservation.

While recognizing the limitations of achievement tests, Dr. Officer felt they had their place. He explained (but did not excuse) the repetitious testing that had occurred on the Pine Ridge Reservation.

In regard to basic research, he pointed to the wide variation among Indian tribes on such factors as bilingualism, biculturalism and acculturation. He called for basic studies of tribal groups that have relatively high achievement in school which would examine the relationship of high achievement to these and other cultural characteristics.

Finally, Dr. Officer indicated that he favored research connected with experimentation, that calls for a multi-disciplinary approach, and that ties researchers in with the administrator. In the past, communication between researchers and BIA administrators was inadequate. The researcher must sometimes hook his private interests on to public interests in order to get funding. A lot of good "pure" research has come out of projects that were pretty well structured in the beginning.

Vine Deloria

Mr. Deloria felt that funds were likely to be given with the idea that Indian education research will help point the way toward making Indians more like white society. The challenge, he asserted, is to Indian leaders to define education in their terms, their values. But, in addition, it is important that Indians have an economic base, that is, the chance to get funds directly for whatever local, immediate need they have, without complex, restrictive rules or qualifications.

Panel Discussion III: What Kinds of Research on Indian Education Are Needed?

Glen Nimnicht

Dr. Nimnicht made two points he considered important: 1) research should be related to a practical problem of importance to the Indians involved; and 2) a variety of research programs were needed, from controlled, quantitative ones to experimental ones to improve school administration.

Reporting on studies being planned by the National Indian Youth Council with four regional educational laboratories, he said it was decided that the Indians should make the decisions about their needs and the lab people would act as advisers. These experimental and demonstration schools, starting with preschool and running for six years, will involve local people in the decisions and should develop new methods and approaches that improve not only Indian education, but education for children of similar circumstances in other groups.

Thomas A. Segundo

Mr. Segundo stressed first that if the Indian people are to be the object of a study, they should be involved to the maximum. It must be remembered, however, that Indian education belongs to the larger American setting, for each year more Indian children are enrolled in public schools and their parents become more concerned about activities in these schools. Indian leadership has always shown this concern for Indian involvement in any reservation or off-reservation undertaking that involves Indians.

Mr. Segundo said that his people have always felt the need for more and better schools and therefore undertook, in 1965, the Papago Survey, an educational survey through which Papago leaders and the educators involved sought the scientific data and bases upon which to develop Community Action programs.

A principal lesson learned was that competent persons are needed to conduct a survey, but it is just as necessary that Indian participants be knowledgeable about the aims and purposes of the survey. In addition, Indian participants must be adequately trained, instructed, and supervised for an educational survey that takes place on a reservation.

An equally important lesson learned was that findings and recommendations can sometimes reflect more the viewpoints and aspirations of the individuals involved in the survey. An interviewer could enter what he thought an elderly non-English speaking Papago probably said.

The statement has been made here that the Indian should be the driver and the specialist the "map reader" in a study. I agree that Indians wish to be in the driver's seat on their own reservation, but I want the map reader to have the best qualifications to give the finest direction.

The aim, Mr. Segundo felt, was for the best developed research plan possible for an Indian reservation, but from the start it should involve the Indian tribal organization.

Samuel Stanley

We must realize, Dr. Stanley said, that Indians do not want an education that makes middle-class whites out of them. Education should help them to continue adjusting to their environment.

Two concepts used by anthropologists are apropos: "cultural pluralism," where different cultures all get along, and "wholeism," meaning that you look at the whole culture to study one aspect of it. In other words, we must do research on Indian culture to study education. He brought up the notion of community, saying that Indians define themselves as members of their community much more than mobile whites do and that rather than leave and lose a part of one's self, many stay, even with a lower living standard.

Dr. Stanley proposed a 3-5 year program of research, beginning with a survey census on Indian population characteristics, followed by intensive field work in the communities to gain an understanding of the culture values and needs, all to be done with strong Indian involvement.

Sol Tax

Those Indians who want to accept complete assimilation can readily do so, Dr. Tax said. We are concerned here with the ones who want to retain their culture and values, yet need the benefits of the modern economy. How can we help them? At the University of Chicago, we have worked through "action anthropology," he said--a special kind of community development. He proposed this method on a large scale, finding where the Indian people are, educationally, and working with them to help them get where they want to be.

Miles V. Zintz

As an educator, Dr. Zintz feels we need more reading material of broad coverage without stereotypes for children. He believes three objectives are important in Indian education: 1) to transmit the cultural heritage; 2) to develop economic sufficiency; 3) to promote participation in the democratic process. True bilingual schools and broader teacher background could help in developing the cultural pluralism our system theoretically endorses.

Another point made was that teachers are desperately needed who understand teaching English as a second language; much corrective reading is necessary to fight educational retardation.

In closing, he said that much formal schooling is structured so that success is impossible for some pupils; we must take into consideration the Indian child's handicap to give him reason to try to succeed.

Ronald Corwin

Dr. Corwin felt more comparative research is needed, as well as a framework for studying the many different Indian communities. In basic studies, certain "points of intervention" are important to consider, such as community variables and interaction between students, teachers, and the community. In discussing a possible national study, he said it was essential to involve the people really concerned.

Panel Discussion IV: How Can Conceptualizations Drawn from Social, Behavioral and Educational Theory and Research Be Applied to the Study of Indian Education?

Brewton Berry

Dr. Berry said many of the Indians with whom he has worked have problems of self-identity. But in his opinion, sociologists have devoted too much research effort to a few problems such as discrimination and prejudice. Very appropriate in research on Indian education are pluralism and assimilation, and factors retarding or accelerating them need to be studied.

The basic question, however, before deciding on which sociological concepts to accept, is, "What are the goals of Indian education?"

Samuel M. Brownell

Although the federal government has a unique relationship to the education of Indians, it would appear that this education has so far been inadequate. Many of the problems are similar to those of other low income groups, but Dr. Brownell said he is uncertain whether education is to strengthen or weaken Indian tribal life. Which customs help in the development of these children and in what areas do their parents want assistance? Dr. Brownell said we must learn what the positive elements have been which help special cultural groups take their place in a multi-cultural world.

He said he believes an action program is needed, as well as research to help Indian youngsters, a program set within the framework of Indian cultural and national purposes.

Irwin Deutscher

Dr. Deutscher observed that some speakers have implied disillusionment over how seldom we have implemented our research findings in the

past. However, he pointed out, we must understand things first to do something intelligent about them. In research, we must have a clear notion of the purposes for which the facts are gathered.

Perhaps it is better not to have implemented all the research, since goals for Indians are changing. We must specify why this research and what we hope to learn. He stressed "ethnoscience" as a new approach in the derivation of concepts. They must be found among the people themselves, he said, not invented by anthropologists. The problems of Indian education are, to some degree, the problems of other minority and low-income groups; however, they cannot be isolated from other social, economic, and psychological problems of Indians.

David W. Stevens

As an economist, Dr. Stevens feels this discipline is also important in a study of Indian education. He pointed out that the resources being sought by those concerned with Indian education are scarce and many groups are competing for these same resources. Therefore, Indians and the BIA must provide adequate reasons why Indians rather than (or as well as) other groups should obtain these "resource needs."

Dr. Stevens cited various ways in which economic analysis could be applied to clearer understanding of educational goals and the resources needed to attain these goals. He also suggested that arguments need to be developed that will indicate ways in which Indian education will benefit not only Indians, but the school district, the state, and the nation.

Dr. Stevens urged that the needs of Indian education should be presented in these economic terms that had more general applicability in order to provide Indians with a more responsive hearing in high government circles.

Melvin D. Thom

Mr. Thom said he believes education is a means to an end and asked what the real purpose would be for the Indians. What concerned him most was whether Indians would be truly involved in making major decisions rather than just agreeing to others' plans.

In all studies being made, he stressed the hope that researchers would recognize that Indians do not necessarily wish to become middle class whites, that they should be treated with dignity, not merely as "subjects," and that research results should be made available to them.

Plenary Session: Suggested Approaches to A National Study of American Indian Education

Summary of General Discussion

This session evolved into a roundtable discussion which focused upon several specific recommendations related to the substantive nature of the proposed status study. Some of the major suggestions made were:

1. A strong plea was made for the collection of as much information as possible needed for the identification and understanding of the many kinds of Indian and quasi-Indian populations.

2. The study should include a comparative analysis of teachers of Indian students in public and Indian schools.

3. The study might examine the dynamics of the interaction of the school and the community and of the development of the Indian child's image of self and his reactions and attitudes towards school.

4. Focusing on the Indian student, one might investigate the broad question of what happens when the Indian child goes to school? What non-cognitive forces influence the learning process in mixed and all-Indian classes?

5. A school model could be drawn for the various levels on which Indian education takes place.

   a. the grass roots school
   b. the mission school
   c. the BIA school
   d. the public school
   e. the specialized school serving Indians
   f. the specialized school for the general public, which may also be attended by individual Indians

6. The principal focus of the study should be on the schools in which Indians are enrolled, as socio-cultural institutions.

7. Indians should be involved to the fullest extent possible in the research process.

8. The research findings of the study should be presented in such a manner as to be of maximum use to Indian leadership in the development of educational policy and program recommendations to serve more effectively the needs of Indian people.

The final recommendation was put in the form of a formal resolution which was unanimously approved by all participants present. It stated:

Resolution

The participants in the National Research Conference on American Indian Education urge that Indian leadership be involved in all major decisions leading to the development and implementation of the proposed national study of American Indian education. Indian leadership should have a major voice in selecting the director(s) of the study and the auspices under which it is conducted, and they should be consulted on the design and the procedures for carrying out the study.

It is recommended that as a means of effecting this resolution, the U. S. Office of Education should seek the cooperation of the National Indian Advisory Committee, recently established by the Assistant Commissioner for Education, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and representing leaders of seventeen major tribal groups.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

In retrospect, it seems that despite the diversity of the participants' academic backgrounds and their experience in the education of Indian children, they reached a remarkable degree of agreement about the directions that a national study of Indian education should take. As a group they did not think it appropriate to define the specific nature and design of such a study. That responsibility must lie with the researchers who will direct it. However, there was considerable consensus concerning certain broad guidelines that might provide a framework for those who will have this responsibility.

In summary, then, they recommended that:

A. A national study of Indian education is greatly needed and should be begun as expeditiously as possible. Such a study should:

1) Provide Indian leadership with systematic and objective information about the attitudes, aspirations, and expectations of a cross-section of their peoples regarding education.

2) Provide Indian leadership and the officials of governmental and non-governmental educational agencies which serve Indian children with basic information to assist in planning more effectively for the educational needs of the Indian populace.

3) Provide governmental agencies with information for arriving at a more adequate basis for the allocation of demonstration and research funds for Indian education.

4) Provide base line data so that experimental and demonstration programs can be more adequately and systematically compared over a period of time with each other and with current ongoing programs.

5) Systematically draw together, summarize and evaluate the results of past and current research on Indian education so as to more adequately articulate the results of those studies with current and future instructional programs and research studies.

6) Draw together findings from research on the education of other sub-cultural groups in American society (e.g., the American Negro) and of sub-cultural groups in other societies (e.g., the Yemenites in Israel) which have particular relevance to programs for American Indian education.

B. Such a study should draw upon the theoretical conceptualizations and methodological approaches of several of the various social and behavioral science disciplines, each applied in a coordinated but independent manner to the examination of Indian education. Such a multi-disciplinary approach was regarded as preferable to a fully-integrated inter-disciplinary approach which might dilute the unique contributions of the various participating disciplines.

C. Intelligence and psychological testing (including achievement tests) should be utilized in this study only after a thorough examination of the relevance of these tests when applied to populations of Indian children and only after a thorough investigation of the availability of the same or comparable data on the subject population. It was felt that there had been far too much repetitive, and indiscriminate use of, testing on Indian children in past research studies.

D. Such a study should include some aspects which will allow for the observation or periodic restudy of Indian educational settings over an extended period of time. This phase would allow for in-depth study of changes that occur in the children and in the school, and of the structural processes which affect these changes.

E. Such a study must utilize sampling procedures that will assure an adequate cross-section of Indian children in the various kinds of school settings in which they are presently being educated. This should include Bureau of Indian Affairs schools, public schools and mission schools, and should include schools located in various social settings (e.g., reservations, rural non-reservation locales, and urban areas, and institutions of higher education and vocational as well as academic schools). This cross-section should include some representation of the various broad types of cultural patterns found among the over 300 Indian tribal groups located in various geographic regions of the nation. For this purpose it would seem that the

major unit of study should be the school as a socio-cultural institution.

F. Such a study should probably involve in its field operations a number of different research institutions located centrally to areas where sizable numbers of Indians are located. The overall planning, direction, and coordination, however, should be located in a single research organization.

G. The major recommendation of the Conference, one that was supported unanimously in a resolution passed by the participants attending its concluding session, was that Indian leadership must be involved in all the major decisions leading to the development and implementation of such a study. Indian leadership should have a major voice in selecting the director(s) of the study and auspices under which it is conducted. It was further recommended that the mechanism for involving Indian leadership in this decision-making process should be the National Indian Education Advisory Committee. There was also general agreement that Indians should have major involvement in the study by:

1) engaging, to the fullest extent possible, Indians who are professionally trained researchers in the design and direction of the study.

2) training and utilizing Indians, to the fullest extent possible, in data collection and analysis.

3) presenting the research results in such a manner as to be of maximum use to Indian leadership in the development of educational policies for Indians and in recommending more effective educational programs to serve Indian peoples.

There was not complete unanimity about all (or perhaps even most) of the recommendations made above. Some of the participants may even take sharp exception to one or more of these points. However, the above represent the points about which there was general consensus.

The participants shared the expectation that the guidelines which this Conference recommended would be regarded as suggestive rather than restrictive and hampering to those who will have ultimate responsibility

for planning and carrying out the study. They were sensitive to the need for the application of imagination in designing, and flexibility in implementing, any study that is to take into account the diversity of the groups that are idendified as American Indians across this nation and the diversity of institutional settings found in those schools which Indian children and youth attend. It was anticipated that the framework offered here will facilitate the efforts of the researcher to seek new and innovative approaches to the study of Indian education.

POST-CONFERENCE ACTIVITIES

Shortly following the Conference, the U. S. Office of Education asked the National Indian Education Advisory Committee (NIEAC) to join USOE in planning for a national study of American Indian education. Subsequently NIEAC appointed a sub-committee for this purpose. The members are: Johnson Holy Rock, President, Oglala Sioux Tribal Council; Logan Koopee, Chairman, Hopi Tribal Council; Flore Lekanof, then President, Alaska Federation of Native Associations; Ronnie Lupe, Chairman, White Mountain Apache Tribal Council; Melvin O. Thom, Chairman of the Walker River Paiute Tribal Council; and James Wilson, Chief, Indian Division, OEO/CAP. Charles Zellers, the newly appointed Assistant Commissioner for Education, Bureau of Indian Affairs, now serves as an ex officio member of that sub-committee.

Members of this sub-committee met with representatives of USOE and BIA and the Project Director to review the findings and recommendations of the National Research Conference on American Indian Education and to consider who might be the most qualified person to undertake the direction of a national study of Indian education. It was unanimously recommended that Robert J. Havighurst of the University of Chicago should be asked to take on this task and to draw up a study proposal. Professor Havighurst is a distinguished researcher in the sociology and psychology of education and has had a continuing interest in the education of American Indians since his earlier research in this area (9). The recommendation that Professor Havighurst be asked to become principal investigator of the study was later approved by the total membership of NIEAC.

Professor Havighurst agreed to undertake this responsibility and, with the assistance of the Conference Staff, developed a proposal for a study of the education of American Indian children and youth on a nationwide scale.

The National Study of American Indian Education, was funded by the U. S. Office of Education on February 1, 1968 and will run through 1970. The project has two parts--an Extensive Phase and an Intensive Phase. The latter, to begin this summer, will be under the general direction of Dr. Havighurst and a project director, to be named. They will have the major responsibility of planning and coordinating the activities of a field work staff at Chicago and three other universities. Each field work team will consist of five persons under the direction of an anthropologist with a special knowledge of Indians in a particular geographical region. The teams will observe and collect information on school children, and interview pupils, parents, teachers, and community leaders on attitudes and expectations regarding education of Indian children. Indians are to be trained and utilized to the fullest possible extent in the study, both in the design and in collection and analysis of data.

The Extensive Phase, already under way, is directed by Dr. Herbert A. Aurbach, associate professor of education and sociology, The Pennsylvania State University, and focuses on the present status of education of Indian children and various factors affecting it. Among questions which will be explored are: "What proportion of Indian children enter and complete high school? What proportions are enrolled in various types of schools--day and boarding, public, mission, and Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools? What is the achievement level in various types of schools?" Sources to be used include reports of government agencies such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the U. S. Census Bureau and data collected from departments of education in states with large Indian populations and from research projects now under way. The results of this phase of the study will be reported in early 1969.

It is expected that the National Study of American Indian Education will provide Indian leaders and officials of educational and other governmental agencies which serve Indians with: 1) objective information about the attitudes, aspirations and expectations of Indian peoples regarding education; 2) basic information to assist in planning more effectively for the educational needs of the Indian populace; and 3) base line data against which to evaluate more effectively the growing number of experimental and demonstration programs for the education of Indian children.

REFERENCES

1. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Fiscal Year 1963, Statistics Concerning Indian Education. (Lawrence, Kansas: The Haskell Press, 1963.)

2. U. S. Department of Labor. 1966 Manpower Report of the President and a Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization and Training by the U. S. Department of Labor. (Washington: U. S. Department of Labor, March 1966.)

3. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Fiscal Year 1965, Statistics Concerning Indian Education. (Lawrence, Kansas: The Haskell Press, 1965.)

4. Coleman, James A. et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.)

5. Havighurst, Robert J. and Bernice L. Neugarten. American Indian and White Children, a Socio-psychological Investigation. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.)

6. Zintz, Miles V. The Indian Research Study, Sections I and II. University of New Mexico, CRP 275, Aug. 1957-July 1960.

7. Wax, Murray L., Rosalie H. Wax, and Robert V. Dumont, Jr. Formal Education in an American Indian Community. Supplement to Social Problems, 11:4 (Spring, 1964).

8. Proceedings of the National Research Conference on American Indian Education, ed. Herbert A. Aurbach. (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Society for the Study of Social Problems, 1967.)

9. Havighurst and Neugarten, op. cit.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM

NATIONAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION

sponsored by

THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

with

The College of Education

The College of Liberal Arts

and

Continuing Education

of

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 24 - 27, 1967

at

The J. Orvis Keller Building

The Pennsylvania State University

University Park, Pennsylvania

PROGRAM

NATIONAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION

EVENING, WEDNESDAY, MAY 24

Registration

Chairman: HERBERT A. AURBACH
The Pennsylvania State University

Welcome

J. RALPH RACKLEY, Provost
The Pennsylvania State University

LEWIS COSER, President-elect
Society for the Study of Social Problems

Background Presentation

I. An Historical Perspective - A Selective Review and Critical Evaluation of Earlier Research Efforts in American Indian Education

Speaker - PHILLEO NASH, Anthropology, Former Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs

Panel Discussion I: Reaction and Further Commentary on Background Presentation I

Panelists: FRANCIS McKINLEY, Education, Arizona State University

EDWARD SPICER, Anthropology, University of Arizona

VICTOR CHARLO, Indian Services, University of Utah

General Discussion

MORNING, THURSDAY, MAY 25

Registration

Informal Discussion

Chairman: MRS. GEORGEANN ROBINSON, Vice President
National Congress of American Indians

Background Presentation

II. Current Research on American Indian Education: Critical Review of Selected Ongoing Studies

Speaker - WILLIAM KELLY, Anthropology, Bureau of Ethnic Research, University of Arizona

III. Action Programs in American Indian Education: Implications for Research from Selected Current Programs

Speaker - JAMES WILSON, Indian Division, Community Action Programs, Office of Economic Opportunity

Free Period (Lunch)

AFTERNOON, THURSDAY, MAY 25

Chairman: PAUL B. FOREMAN, Sociology
The Pennsylvania State University

Panel Discussion II: Reactions and Further Commentary on Background Presentations II and III

Panelists: VINE DELORIA, National Congress of American Indians

JAMES OFFICER, Anthropology, Bureau of Indian Affairs

ROBERT A. ROESSEL, Jr., Education, Rough Rock Demonstration School

BERNARD SPILKA, Psychology, University of Denver

ROBERT THOMAS, Anthropology, Wayne State University

MURRAY WAX, Sociology, University of Kansas

General Discussion

Break - Informal Discussion

Small Group Discussion I - Continuation in small groups (approximately 10 persons each) of Panel Discussions I and II, focusing on specific areas that come out of panel discussions.

The background presentations and ensuing panel and small group discussions will focus on such questions as the following:

1. How have the problems of Indian education research been formulated?

2. What sort of assumptions underlie the studies that have been conducted?

3. What are the reasons for the particular directions this research has taken?

4. To what extent has the range of problems been limited and why?

   a. To particular problem areas
   b. To particular academic disciplines
   c. To particular methodological approaches
   d. To particular groups of Indians

5. What are the apparent gaps? What is not being studied and why?

6. To what extent has funding limited the kinds of research done and why?

   a. Limited funds available
   b. Support limited to certain types of studies

7. What procedures (methodology) have been used to study Indian education?

8. What have been the practical problems in the field?

   a. Have field conditions limited the research done? How and why?
   b. What strategic and logistic problems have there been in carrying out research?
   c. Have there been difficulties in securing the cooperation of key people? Who ought to be involved? How do we get their cooperation?
   d. How can future field research avoid the pitfalls implied in a, b, c above.

9. What do we know about Indian education as a result of the research?

10. What kind of impact has the research had?

11. To what extent have past studies been translated into action programs?

12. What are the various kinds of programs which seek to provide for the educational needs of the American Indian?

13. To what extent are current action programs being adequately evaluated?

Conference Banquet - (sponsored by The Pennsylvania State University)

MORNING, FRIDAY, MAY 26

Informal Discussion

Summary: Small Group Discussion I - Room 312

Chairman: OZZIE G. SIMMONS, Sociology, University of Colorado

Panel Discussion III: What Kinds of Research on Indian Education Are Needed?

Panelists: RONALD CORWIN, Sociology, Office of Education (on leave, Ohio State University)

GLEN NIMNICHT, Education, Colorado State College and Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development

THOMAS A. SEGUNDO, Papago Community Action Program

SAMUEL STANLEY, Anthropology, Smithsonian Institute

SOL TAX, Anthropology, University of Chicago

MILES V. ZINTZ, Education, University of New Mexico

General Discussion

Free Period (Lunch)

AFTERNOON, FRIDAY, MAY 26

Small Group Discussion II - Continuation in small groups of Panel Discussion III. Each group will focus on specific areas that come out of the panel discussion.

The panel and ensuing small group discussions will address themselves to such questions as the following:

1. Why do we need research on Indian education or do we?

2. What are the highest priority questions and hypotheses which need to be examined first?

3. How can Indian communities (tribes) be most meaningfully classified to relate our research to educational policy questions?

4. What target populations can be studied cross-sectionally to adequately represent "Indians?"

5. What target populations should be longitudinally studied first to provide us with the best approximation of the range of problems that need investigation?

6. What priorities should be given to basic research, applied research, and evaluation of demonstration programs? Should we focus on long or short range research objectives?

7. Where should government agencies put their research dollars, relative to 6., above?

8. What kind of research would be most relevant for policy development on Indian education?

Break - Informal Discussion

Summary: Small Group Discussion II

Chairman: WILLIAM F. NYDEGGER, Anthropology
The Pennsylvania State University

Panel Discussion IV: What Kinds of Conceptualizations Can Be Drawn From Social, Behavioral, and Educational Theory and Related Research? How May These Conceptualizations Be Applied to the Study of American Indian Education?

Panelists: BREWTON BERRY, Sociology, Ohio State University

SAMUEL BROWNELL, Urban Educational Administration, Yale University

IRWIN DEUTSCHER, Sociology, Syracuse University

DAVID STEVENS, Economics, The Pennsylvania State University

MELVIN D. THOM, Walker River Paiute Tribal Council

General Discussion

EVENING, FRIDAY, MAY 26

Conference Reception and Buffet - (sponsored by The Pennsylvania State University)

MORNING, SATURDAY, MAY 27

Chairman: HERBERT A. AURBACH

General Discussion: Where Do We Go From Here? Conference Recommendations for a National Status Study and for Future Long-Range Research on American Indian Education.

1. What should be the focus of the National Status Study?

2. What type of methodology should be employed in data gathering?

3. What kind of sampling should be employed to get adequate representation of "Indians?"

   a. For purposes of the study, who is an Indian? Shall the study be limited to those Indians who are on reservations? To those who have a tribal membership. To those who identify themselves as Indians?
   b. How can we adequately sample the 400 tribal groups and the various kinds of social settings in which members of each tribal group live?
   c. How do we define "education" for purposes of this study? Do we include only public education? Do we include adult education?

4. What methodology should be employed in analyzing the data obtained (e.g.,multi-variant vs. contingency analysis)?

5. How can this study be formulated so that the results can be most meaningfully translated into action programs?

6. How can the results be disseminated for widest effect?

7. How can the results help formulate longer-range research?

Break - Informal Discussion

Summary and Recommendations - HERBERT A. AURBACH

APPENDIX B

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

NATIONAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION

May 24-27, 1967

The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Ablon, Joan
Research Anthropologist
New Mexico Division of Mental Health

Adair, John
Professor of Anthropology
San Francisco State College

Anderson, James G.
Research Professor of Educational Administration
New Mexico State University

Bass, Willard P.
Indian Education Specialist
Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory

Benham, William J.
Assistant Area Director (Education)
Bureau of Indian Affairs

Berry, Brewton
Professor of Sociology and Anthropology
Ohio State University

Bonito, Wesley
Athletic Director
Education Committee
Tribal Education, White Mountain Apache Tribal Council

Brownell, Samuel M.
Professor of Urban Educational Administration
Yale University

Charlo, Victor A.
Field Specialist
University of Utah

Cline, Edward L.
Family Counselor
Omaha Tribe of Nebraska

Coe, Pam
National Representative
American Indian Program
American Friends Service Comm.

Collier, John, Jr.
Professor of Anthropology & Education
San Francisco State College

Corwin, Ronald G.
Acting Branch Chief
Elementary-Secondary Education Research
U. S. Office of Education

Coser, Lewis A.
Professor of Sociology
Brandeis University

Deloria, Vine
Executive Director
National Congress of American Indians

Deutscher, Irwin
Professor of Sociology
Syracuse University

Ducheneaux, Frank
Chairman
Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe in South Dakota

Erickson, Donald A.
Associate Professor of Education
University of Chicago

Forbes, Jack D.
Research Program Director
Far West Laboratory

Foreman, Paul B.
Professor of Sociology
The Pennsylvania State University

Foster, Gordon
Dean of Instruction
Northern Arizona University

George, Rosemary
Special Assistant to Deputy Assistant Secretary (Education)
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Greene, Joel E.
Chairman of Department of Behavioral Science
New Mexico Highlands University

Hargis, Jerry L.
Coordinator of Adult Education
Bureau of Indian Affairs

Hjelm, Howard F.
Director
Division of Elementary and Secondary Education Research
U. S. Office of Education

Jenny, Albert
Research Scientist
Human Sciences Research, Inc.

Jones, J. Charles
Professor of Education
Bucknell University

Kelly, William H.
Director, Bureau of Ethnic Research
University of Arizona

Lantis, Margaret
Professor of Anthropology
University of Kentucky

Lundeen, Glenn C.
Chief, Branch of Public School Relations
Bureau of Indian Affairs

McDowell, Charles R.
Press Secretary to Senator Paul Fannin
U. S. Senate

McKinley, Francis
Field Coordinator
Arizona State University

Morgan, Griscom
Associate
Community Service, Inc.

Nash, Philleo
Consultant
Counselors on National Problems

Nimnicht, Glen
Program Director
Far West Educational Laboratory for Research and Development

Nydegger, William F.
Assistant Professor of Anthropology
The Pennsylvania State University

Officer, James E.
Associate Commissioner
Bureau of Indian Affairs

Owens, Charles S.
Director of Indian Education
New Mexico State Department of Education

Parmeter, Adrian L.
Program Coordinator
U.S.O.E. Bureau of Research

Rath, Robert R.
Research and Development Specialist
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

Robinson, Georgeann Mrs.
First Vice President
National Congress of American Indians

Roessel, Robert, Jr.
Director
Rough Rock Demonstration School

Segundo, Thomas A.
Director, Papago Community Action Program
The Papago Tribe of Arizona

Simmons, Ozzie G.
Professor & Director, Institute of Behavioral Science
University of Colorado

Snider, Glenn
Professor of Education
University of Oklahoma

Spicer, Edward H.
Professor of Anthropology
University of Arizona

Spilka, Bernard
Professor of Psychology
University of Denver

Stanley, Samuel
Anthropology Program Director
Smithsonian Institution

Stevens, David W.
Assistant Professor of Economics
The Pennsylvania State University

Stewart, James C., Jr.
Oklahomans for Indian Opportunity

Tax, Sol
Professor of Anthropology
University of Chicago

Thom, Melvin D.
Executive Director
National Indian Youth Council
Walker River Paiute Tribal Council

Thomas, Robert K.
Co-Director
Carnegie Corp. Cross-Cultural Education Project
University of Chicago

Voget, Fred W.
Professor of Anthropology
Southern Illinois University

Wax, Murray
Professor of Sociology
University of Kansas

Wilson, James
Chief of Indian Division
Community Action Program
U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity

Yazzie, Allen D.
Chairman
Tribal Education
Navajo Tribal Council Member

Zintz, Miles V.
Professor of Education
University of New Mexico

APPENDIX C

CONSULTANTS

NATIONAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION

The Pennsylvania State University

Dr. Brewton Berry
Professor Emeritus
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Ohio State University

Mr. Wendell Chino
President
Mescalero Apache Tribal Business Committee

Mr. Madison Coombs
Deputy Assistant
Commissioner for Education
Bureau of Indian Affairs

Dr. Ronald Corwin, Professor
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Ohio State University

Dr. Lewis Coser, Professor
Department of Sociology
Brandeis University

Mr. Vine Deloria
Executive Director
National Congress of American Indians

Dr. Robert Havighurst, Professor
Department of Education
University of Chicago

Dr. William Kelly, Director
Bureau of Ethnic Research
University of Arizona

Mr. Flore Lekanof, President
Alaska Federation of Native Associations

Dr. Philleo Nash, Consultant
Counselors on National Problems

Dr. James Officer
Associate Commissioner
Bureau of Indian Affairs

Dr. Robert Roessel, Jr., Director
Rough Rock Demonstration School

Dr. Ozzie Simmons, Professor
Department of Sociology
University of Colorado

Dr. Edward Spicer, Professor
Department of Sociology
University of Arizona

Dr. Sol Tax, Professor
Department of Anthropology
University of Chicago

Mr. Melvin Thom
Executive Director
National Indian Youth Council

Dr. James Wilson, Director
Indian Division, OEO/CAP

APPENDIX D

CONTRIBUTORS TO PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION

HERBERT A. AURBACH

Associate Professor of Education and Sociology, The Pennsylvania State University
Secretary-Treasurer, Society for the Study of Socia.. Problems
Project Director, National Research Conference on American India1 Education
Formerly on faculties of Duquesne University, Mississippi State University, North Carolina State University, and University of Pittsburgh
Associate Editor, Social Problems
Author of numerous monographs and articles in professional journals on minority problems and education
Ph.D., University of Kentucky

BREWTON BERRY

Professor Emeritus of Sociology and Anthropology, Ohio State University
Formerly Director of Archaeological Survey of Missouri and editor, Missouri Archaeologist
Author of Race Relations and numerous other books and articles in professional journals on minority group relations and archaeology
Ph.D., University of Edinburgh

SAMUEL M. BROWNELL

Professor of Education, Yale University and the University of Connecticut (joint appointment)
U. S. Commissioner of Education 1953-56
Superintendent of Public Schools, Detroit, 1956-66, and of Grosse Pointe, Mich., 1927-38
Formerly President, New Haven State Teachers College, and on the faculty of New York State Teachers College (Albany)
Has conducted or co-directed numerous school surveys for cities in New England and other areas, and contributed to various educational journals
Ph.D., Yale University

VICTOR CHARLO

Field Specialist in Training, Bureau of Indian Services, University of Utah
Previously a Community Action Program Tribal Assistant Director and a Tutor Counselor, University of Montana
Member Flathead Indian Tribe
B.A., University of Montana

LEWIS COSER

Professor of Sociology, Brandeis University
President, Society for the Study of Social Problems
President, Eastern Sociological Society
Associate Editor, Social Problems
Advisory Editor, American Journal of Sociology
Author of The Functions of Social Conflict and numerous other books and articles in professional journals and literary magazines
Taught at the University of California (Berkeley) and the University of Chicago
Ph.D., Columbia University

RONALD CORWIN

Associate Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Ohio State University
Education Research and Program Specialist, U. S. Office of Education, 1966-67
Formerly on the faculties of Teachers College, Columbia University, and the University of Minnesota
Author of Sociology of Education and numerous other books, monographs, and articles in professional journals on the sociology of education and of the professions
Ph.D., University of Minnesota

VINE DELORIA

Executive Director, National Congress of American Indians
Author of many articles on Indian rights
Member Standing Rock Sioux Tribe
B. S., Iowa State University
B.D., Lutheran School of Theology

IRWIN DEUTSCHER

Professor of Sociology, Maxwell Graduate School, Syracuse University
Former Director, Youth Development Center, Syracuse University
Held Post-Doctoral Fellowships with the National Institute of Mental Health and National Science Foundation
Past President, Society for the Study of Social Problems
Author of Among the People, Encounters with the Poor, and numerous articles in professional journals on social problems and other areas of sociology
Ph.D., University of Missouri

WILLIAM KELLY

Director, Bureau of Ethnic Research, and Professor of Anthropology, University of Arizona
Director of studies in Indian education
Author of numerous monographs and articles in professional journals on Indians of the Southwestern United States
Ph.D., Harvard University

FRANCIS McKINLEY

Field Coordinator, Vista Program, Arizona State University
Former Director of Community Services and member of Tribal Council, Ute Indian Tribe
Formerly Director of Vista Training Program, University of Wisconsin
M.A. (Educational Psychology), University of Utah

PHILLEO NASH

Consulting Anthropologist, Washington, D. C.
U. S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs 1961-66
Between 1942-1966 served Federal government as assistant or consultant to the President, the Secretary of War, and the Director of War Information
Lieutenant-Governor of Wisconsin 1959-61
Author of numerous government reports and articles in professional journals on Indians and other minority groups
Ph.D., University of Chicago

GLEN NIMNICHT

Program Director, Far West Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
Director, New Nursery School, Colorado State College
Formerly Director of Experimental Program in Teacher Education and the Nursery School
Author of a number of reports and articles in professional journals on education and deprived children
Ed.D., Stanford University

JAMES E. OFFICER

Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs
U. S. representative to Inter-American Indian Institute, 1964 and 1966
Consultant, Secretary's Task Force on Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, 1961
Formerly Assistant Director, Bureau of Ethnic Research, University of Arizona
Author of Indians in School and numerous articles on Indians and Mexican-Americans in professional journals
Ph.D., University of Arizona

J. RALPH RACKLEY

Provost, formerly Vice-President for Instruction, and Dean of College of Education, The Pennsylvania State University
Superintendent of Public Instruction, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1965-67
Former Deputy Commissioner and Acting Commissioner, U. S. Office of Education
Former Dean, College of Education, University of Oklahoma and Teachers College of Connecticut
President of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1961-62
Ph.D. (History), George Peabody College, Tennessee

ROBERT A. ROESSEL, JR.

Director, Rough Rock Demonstration School, Chinle, Arizona
Professor of Education and formerly Director, Indian Education Center, Arizona State University
Taught and was administrator of a BIA school on a Navajo Reservation, 1952-58
Ph.D., Arizona State University

THOMAS A. SEGUNDO

Director, Papago Community Action Program
Helped organize and directed Chicago American Indian Center, 1953-58
Helped organize and chaired Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona, 1951-53
Former Chairman, Papago Tribal Council, 1947-53
Higher education at the University of Arizona, Vallejo College, and University of Chicago

EDWARD H. SPICER

Professor of Anthropology, University of Arizona
Editor of American Anthropologist, 1959-63
Formerly on the faculties of Cornell University, Dillard University, University of California (Santa Barbara) and the University of Chicago
Author of Perspectives in American Indian Cultural Change and other books and numerous articles in professional journals on North American Indians
Ph.D., University of Chicago

BERNARD SPILKA

Professor of Psychology, University of Denver
President-elect, Rocky Mountain Psychological Association
Formerly on the faculty of Washburne University, and former research psychologist with U. S. Air Force and U. S. Navy
Director of studies of alienation and educational achievement among Oglala Sioux and Teton Dakota Indians
Author of Prejudice in America and numerous other books, and articles on psychology in professional journals
Ph.D., Purdue University

SAMUEL STANLEY

Anthropology Program Coordinator, Smithsonian Institution
Has done extensive research on Indians of North America
Working on revision of Handbook of North American Indians
Author of a number of articles on Indians in professional journals
Ph.D., University of Chicago

DAVID W. STEVENS

Assistant Professor of Economics, The Pennsylvania State University
Directed research studies on employment, human resources, and economic factors
Co-author of The Role of the Secondary Schools in the Preparation of Youth for Employment and author of several monographs and articles in professional journals on economics
Ph.D., University of Colorado

SOL TAX

Dean of University Extension and Professor of Anthropology, University of Chicago
Ethnologist, Carnegie Institution, 1934-1948
Editor, Current Anthropology, and Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, and former Editor, American Anthropologist
President, American Anthropological Association, 1958-1959
Author of Horizons of Anthropology and many other books and articles in professional journals on anthropology
Ph.D., University of Chicago

MELVIN D. THOM

Executive Director, National Indian Youth Council
Chairman, Walker River Paiute Tribe, Nevada
Vice-Chairman, Board of Directors, United Scholarship Service, Denver, Colorado
Consultant on Project Upward Bound and Indian education
B.S., Brigham Young University (Civil Engineering)

ROBERT K. THOMAS

Associate Professor of Education, Monteith College, Wayne State University
Co-Director of the University of Chicago's Carnegie Corporation Cross-Cultural Education Project, Tahlequah, Oklahoma 1963-67
Editor, Indian Voices
An Oklahoma Cherokee Indian, he has lived with and studied many Indian tribes
M.A., University of Arizona